

while I support the 1st Amendment in its right to free speech, I contend that when an organization is disseminating information to the public, the organization has a responsibility to present all sides of the issue in an equal and fair manner. The personal and political agenda of those who own or run the organization should not override this need by the American people for unbiased information.

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an "anti-Kerry" documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. In an effort to be unbiased and fair, it is Sinclair Broadcasting's duty to present both sides of this issue. There are "anti-Bush" documentaries available for airing as well. If it cannot air documentaries covering all angles, perhaps then, it should not be airing such a documentary at all.

However, my main concern is that when media outlet become large conglomerates, the American public loses the ability to hear and see other views and options that disagree with the views held by the top management of these conglomerates.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.